

AGENDA

Herefordshire Schools Forum

Date: **Friday 19 October 2012**

Time: **10.30 am** (see separate letter)

Place: **Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road,
Hereford HR1 1SH**

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

Tim Brown, Governance Services

Tel: 01432 260239

Email: tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format or language, please call Tim Brown, Governance Services on 01432 260239 or e-mail tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk in advance of the meeting.

Agenda for the Meeting of the Herefordshire Schools Forum

Membership

Mr K Crawford	Academies
Mrs D Strutt	Academies
Mr I Peake	14-19 Partnership
Mr S Robertson	14-19 Partnership
Mrs C Lawson	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Mrs J Rees	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Mrs L Townsend	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Mr K Wright	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Mr C Lewandowski	Teaching Staff Representative
Mrs K Rooke	Special Schools Governor
Mr NPJ Griffiths	Academies
Mr J A Chapman	Church of England
Mr P Burbidge	Roman Catholic Church
Mrs S Woodrow	Locally Maintained Secondary Schools
Mr S Pugh	Locally Maintained Primary Schools
Mrs J Cecil	Academies
Mr S Matthews	Academies
Ms T Kneale	Locally Maintained Primary School (Nursery)
Mr T Edwards	Locally Maintained Primary School Governor
Mrs S Bailey	Special Schools
Mr J Docherty	Academies
Mr A Shaw	Academies
Mrs A Jackson	Early Years Representative
Mrs R Lloyd	Early Years Representative
Mr P Barns	Pupil Referral Unit
Mr R Leece	Teaching Staff Representative
vacancy	Locally Maintained Secondary school (Governor)

AGENDA

		Pages
1.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE To receive apologies for absence.	
2.	NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY) To receive any details of Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Forum.	
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
4.	ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN To elect a Chairman for the ensuing year.	
5.	ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN To elect a Vice-Chairman for the ensuing year.	
6.	MINUTES To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2012.	1 - 16
7.	SCHOOLS FORUM CONSTITUTION To inform the Forum of changes to the Forum's Constitution required by Regulations and guidance from the Department for Education.	17 - 22
8.	REPORT OF THE BUDGET WORKING GROUP To consider a report from the Budget Working Group (BWG) on the following issue: National Schools Funding Formula.	23 - 52
9.	MEMBERSHIP OF THE BUDGET WORKING GROUP To review the composition of the Budget Working Group.	53 - 58
10.	WORK PROGRAMME To consider the Forum's work programme.	59 - 60
11.	DATES OF MEETINGS To note that future meetings of the Forum have been scheduled for 9.30am at Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on the following dates: 7 December 2012 25 January 2013 28 February 2013 12 March 2013 (provisional).	

The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public Register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

Please Note:

Agenda and individual reports can be made available in large print. Please contact the officer named on the front cover of this agenda **in advance** of the meeting who will be pleased to deal with your request.

The Council Chamber where the meeting will be held is accessible for visitors in wheelchairs, for whom toilets are also available.

A public telephone is available in the reception area.

Public Transport Links

- Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via bus route 75.
- The service runs every half hour from the 'Hopper' bus station at the Tesco store in Bewell Street (next to the roundabout junction of Blueschool Street / Victoria Street / Edgar Street).
- The nearest bus-stop to Brockington is located in Old Eign Hill near to its junction with Hafod Road. The return journey can be made from the same bus stop.

If you have any questions about this agenda, how the Council works or would like more information or wish to exercise your rights to access the information described above, you may do so either by telephoning officer named on the front cover of this agenda or by visiting in person during office hours (8.45 a.m. - 5.00 p.m. Monday - Thursday and 8.45 a.m. - 4.45 p.m. Friday) at the Council Offices, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford.

COUNTY OF HEREFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

BROCKINGTON, 35 HAFOD ROAD, HEREFORD.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to **Assembly Point A** which is located at the southern entrance to the car park. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of Herefordshire Schools Forum held at Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford HR1 1SH on Friday 6 July 2012 at 9.30 am

Present: Ms T Kneale (Chairman)

Mr A Teale, Mrs K. Rooke, Mrs JS Powell, Mr JA Chapman, Mr P Burbidge, Mrs S Catlow-Hawkins, Mr S Pugh, Mrs J Cecil, Mr P Box, Mr S Matthews, Mrs J Baker, Mr T E Edwards, Mrs S Bailey, Ms A Pritchard, Mrs A Jackson, Mrs R Lloyd, Mr P Barns, Dr M Goodman and Mr J Sheppard

In attendance: Councillor GJ Powell (Cabinet Member – Education & Infrastructure)

Officers: Ms J Davidson, Director for Peoples Services; Mr C Baird, Assistant Director Peoples Services Commissioning; Mr M Green, Senior Finance Manager; Mr R Reid, Head of Commissioning (Sufficiency and Capital Commissioning); Mrs W Boulter, Senior Secondary School Improvement Advisor; Mr P James, Democratic Services.

76. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Mr NPJ Griffiths (Vice-Chairman) and Mrs S Woodrow.

77. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

There were none.

78. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

The Director for Peoples Services explained that the appointment of the Chairman continued until the end of the academic year and therefor the current Chairman, Ms T Kneale would continue in the Chair for this meeting.

79. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

80. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

81. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held 12 March 2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

82. SCHOOL FUNDING REFORM UPDATE AT JULY 2012

The Senior Finance Manager reported that further information had recently been received from the DfE concerning the School Funding Reform consultation which would help to inform later discussion.

The Forum agreed to the inclusion of this extra agenda item.

The Senior Finance Manager issued a hand out, a copy of which is appended to these minutes, providing key points commentary arising from recent information from the DfE concerning the school funding reform covering the main themes of: Schools Funding Block; High Needs Block; Early Years Block; 16-19 (24) Reform Formula. This information would also be presented to Headteachers and school governors. He highlighted in particular the outcomes from the recent DfE consultation and that the maximum permitted lump sum to schools would now be £200,000 for 2013/14 and that different per funding rates for Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 pupils could now be included. A pupil mobility factor would also be permitted.

The Forum debated the information and in response to whether the primary sector would be better off the Senior Finance Manager responded that the budget contained the same amount of money and therefore there would be some winners and some losers. Questioned whether the consultation period could start earlier the Forum noted that the proposed timetable followed the government guidelines. The draft options would be worked on over the summer holidays and presented to the Budget Working Group for consideration. The Forum noted the proposed arrangements for the Heads; Chairs and governor briefings.

RESOLVED: That the position concerning the School Funding Reform consultation be noted.

83. BUDGET WORKING GROUP

The Forum considered a report from the Budget Working Group (BWG) concerning the National Schools Funding Formula.

The Chairman of the Budget Working Group reported that the BWG had considered a discussion paper designed to form the basis of a consultation paper for Herefordshire Schools on the local application of the National Schools Funding Formula, recognising that there were aspects where local choices could be made. The agenda report set out a number of proposals by the BWG together with commentary on the rationale for the resultant recommendations. She also commented that the recent DfE guidance (see previous minute) now substantiated many of the assumptions the BWG had needed to consider.

In the course of discussion the following principal points were noted:

- Questioning the lack of data to enable an allocation for Looked After Children (LAC) the Senior Finance Manager responded that data would be available from the DfE via their budget modelling tool and no allocation was currently made within Herefordshire schools funding formula due to lack of data. LAC funding would be reviewed when preparing the 2014/15 budget, having regard to the approach taken by other authorities.
- The Forum noted the expected DfE target for achieving a year on year convergence to a national primary/secondary ratio anticipated to be 1:1.27. However, no timetable had been set to achieve this. This would have major implications for Herefordshire schools. A member suggested that by the time the government had set the target it may be that Herefordshire was already within the target tolerances and to change the local ratio now could be premature.
- It was confirmed that there would be winners and losers following changes to the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and that a capping mechanism would be in place. While there would be some schools exceeding +/- 10% of their budget the vast majority of schools would be within +/- 2%.

- The Forum appreciated the need to understand the Special Education Need (SEN) side of the funding changes and the changes in SEN that will effect or clash with the funding formula.
- Special school Heads had met to consider funding issues. While the numbers on roll varied this was an opportunity to get funding for SEN pupils at the right rate with moderated access needs. A tariff rate system for SEN children was being considered. It was anticipated that a protocol would be established and while this would have an effect on primary and secondary schools, the result should be a more transparent procedure. The tariff funding would be linked to current budgets.
- To ensure a joined up approach the Council was working with its partners to consider how Health and Social Care budgets could match with the funding formula to support children with additional needs.
- Greater clarity had been given over 19-25 provision and the Council was using its new responsibilities and leading discussions with its partners, including through the locality team plans, to ensure users were involved with the process.

RESOLVED:

It be recommended to the Cabinet Member that the following principles be adopted in preparing the 2013/14 schools budget:

- a) No values be allocated to Looked After Children (LAC) in the first year of implementation, but that this aspect be reviewed in preparing the 2014/15 budget, having regard to the approach taken by other authorities;**
- b) A composite per pupil value be used in secondary schools representing the average value for KS3 and KS4, subject to any guidance from the DfE;**
- c) It be noted that the Forum will be requested to de-delegate the trade union funding;**
- d) It was noted that the DfE intend to move towards national consistency for the primary/secondary ratio which implied a gradual move towards the average of 1:1.27 and Schools Forum requested that consideration be given to the implications of this in developing a strategy for school configuration in the County;**
- e) That schools gaining funds should have the gains capped by the same percentage as used by the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) in order to fund the costs of the MFG; and**
- f) The proposed further discussions with Special School Headteachers and Pupil Referral Units be supported and a progress report be made to the Budget Working Group in July.**

84. DSG BUDGET AND OUT TURN

Schools Forum were informed of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2012/13 and the outturn for 2011/12.

The Senior Finance Manager (SFM) presented the agenda report. He reported that the DSG budget for 2012/13 had been set at £107.378m

During the course of debate the following principal points were noted:

- appended to the report was the S251 table setting out the school and central expenditure position.
- the S251 table now included a column for 'provision for LACSEG' which indicated a deduction of £70k from maintained schools. It was thought that Academies had received more than £70k through their budgets from the Education Funding Agency.

- due to the unexpected adjustment by the DfE to increase the number of early years pupils to meet the 90% minimum threshold for 3 and 4 year old provision DSG had benefited from an extra 54 pupils worth of funding (£256k) which had not been budgeted for. In 2011/12 the adjustment was for only 1 pupil and it had been expected that the adjustment would not apply in 2012/13.
- It was suggested that the Budget Working Group consider options for the use of the additional £256k DSG in conjunction with consideration of the 2011/12 DSG underspend;
- None of the funding within the DSG including early years was ring-fenced however, the DfE's objective was that extra funding arising from the 90% funding floor was to be targeted at increasing participation of 3 and 4 year olds in deprived areas of the county.
- after adjustment the 2012/13 'per pupil funding' passed through to primary schools increased by 1.5%, high schools reduced by 1.7% and special schools increased by 1.2% and the SFM warned that this may adversely affect the primary/secondary school funding ratio.
- The school funding ratio was not a straight forward calculation as it included Free School Meal and other criteria.
- In relation to the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) 2011/12 outturn it was noted that an underspend of £840k had been carried forward to 2012/13 and that this represented less than 1% of the overall DSG. The main budget variances were indicated in the report.
- After adjustment to take account of transfer to academy status the like for like comparison of school balances indicated an increase in balances of £982k from £4,807k in March 2011 (adjusted) to £5,789k in March 2012.
- At the end of 2011/12 five schools and two Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) were in deficit totalling £537k. Recovery plans were being put in place.

RESOLVED That:

- a) The final allocation of DSG for 2012/13 was noted;**
- b) Working with officers of the local authority the Budget Working Group be requested to comment on and develop options for the prioritisation of the DSG underspend (£840k carry forward and the £256k extra 2012/13 DSG funding) with their conclusions being presented as a series of options for consideration by Schools Forum prior to recommendation to the Cabinet Member.**

85. SCHOOLS CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME

The Schools Forum received information on the capital funding arrangements for 2012/13.

The Head of Sufficiency and Capital Commissioning presented the agenda report and highlighted that:

- Herefordshire Council had seen a £2.5m (38%) reduction in Government capital grant compared to last year. Whilst approximately £1m of this was due to the number of schools that had become Academies and therefore had access to other capital funds through the Education Funding Agency, the remaining £1.5m was largely a reduction in Basic Need Grant.
- The Basic Need Grant methodology now takes into account a Local Authority's ability to accommodate new pupils. Herefordshire's significant number of surplus school places puts the County at a disadvantage.
- The reduction in Basic Need Grant was due to a change in the national funding

allocation formula.

- As Herefordshire’s 2012/13 Basic Need Grant included a transitional element to mitigate the full impact of the change in the funding allocation formula, it may be anticipated that Herefordshire’s 2013/14 allocation will be further reduced.
- The 2013/14 capital grant allocations will be announced in late autumn.
- The much reduced Basic Need Grant for 2012/13 has been allocated and earmarked in line with the Capital Strategy, as approved by the Capital Strategy Consultative Group.
- The Locally Controlled Voluntary Aided Programme (LCVAP) has been set by the LCVAP Group in line with Anglican and Roman Catholic Diocesan priorities.
- The Capital Maintenance Grant has been allocated to address the highest capital maintenance priorities, including allocations to address the main areas of health and safety priority works.

Responding to questions concerning overcapacity, particularly at Aylestone Business and Enterprise College, the Head of Sufficiency and Capital Commissioning reported that options were being explored for that particular site, however, the sale of the old building was not currently being contemplated as it was considered short sighted in view of the potential increase in housing being proposed for the area through the Local Development Plan.

RESOLVED: That the Forum noted the contents of the report on the Schools’ Capital Investment Programme.

86. WORK PROGRAMME

In light of today’s meeting it was agreed that the work programme be amended to reflect changes namely:

19 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election of Chairman/Vice-Chairman • Constitutional issues including membership and Role of Budget Working Group • Budget Working Group report including provision for planning for the 2013/14 budget • The addition of an item to consider the outcome of the Schools Fund Reform consultation. • Workplan 2012/13 • Dates of Meetings.
7 December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Funding 13/14 – Final Budget (not draft as indicated). • Consider budget proposals for the High Needs Block. • Workplan for 2013/14.
Subsequent listings	As listed but amend to read workplan for 2013/14.

87. DATES OF MEETINGS

The Forum noted the date for future meetings.

88. LATE ITEMS/ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There were no late items.

The meeting ended at 11.06 am

CHAIRMAN

School Funding Reform Updated July 2012

Summary for Schools Forum and Governors

1. Outcome of recent DfE consultation
2. Post-16 update
3. Emerging proposals
4. Views on consultation with schools

Schools Funding Block Update

1. Different funding rates permitted for KS3 & KS4
2. No minimum threshold for percentages for per pupil funding in 2013/14
3. Deprivation funding – new 6th band added to IDACI indicators
4. Low cost SEN - in future low prior attainment factor permitted and thresholds reduced

Schools Funding Block Update

5. Thresholds lowered primary now 73 points in EYFSP and secondary pupils who fail to achieve level 4 in **both** English & Maths
6. MFG – will now exclude business rates and early years
7. Maximum lump sum increased to £200k for 2013/14
8. Pupil mobility – new factor to be allowed based on number of pupils entering at non-standard entry points

High Needs Block Update

1. Independent and non-maintained special schools will receive base funding from April 2013 – same as academy special schools
2. EFA already started to confirm planned specialist places for 2013/14 with local authorities
3. Half termly charge rates for PRU short term placements and daily rates for part-time places
4. Schools will pay top-up funding for fixed term exclusions, early intervention or off-site direction. LA pays top-ups for remainder.
5. Hospital education – funded by national top-slice of DSG and funding passported to providers via local authority

Early Years Block Update

1. MFG to apply to all early years settings – not just schools – but excludes lump sums and deprivation supplements
2. 90% funding floor for three year olds
 - To be phased out in 2014/15
 - 2013/14 as transition year – to be set at 85% provision or at only 50% of 90% floor
 - In 2012/13 calculated as 54 pupils worth £255k so could reduce to £127k in 2013/14 and £0 in 2014/15.
 - Difficult to predict as only 1 pupil in 2011/12

16-19 (24) Reform Formula Simplification

1. Payment per student system for academic year 2013/14
2. Simplified formula to replace existing funding system entirely
i.e. will fund students rather than each qualification
3. EFA intend to fund all full time programmes at a single funding rate and remove the need to convert guided learning hours to standard learner numbers
4. EFA will reduce the number of programme cost weightings, remove the achievement element and remove the short course modifier and provider factor
5. EFA ambition is for “a simple transparent and fair funding system for all 16-19 year olds”

16-19 (24) Reform Timetable for change

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. On-going formula refinement | June/Sept 2012 |
| 2. Shadow allocations issued | Sept/Oct 2012 |
| 3. EFA Briefings for sixth forms/colleges | Sept/Oct 2012 |
| 4. Final funding rates published | Jan 2013 |
| 5. Initial student numbers issued | Jan 2013 |
| 6. Final Allocations AY 2013/14 | March 2013 |

Herefordshire 16-19 stakeholder event planned for
autumn

Emerging Proposals Subject to change/consultation

General Aim: Budget stability for mainstream schools and High Needs Block

Lump sum	£105,000
Primary per pupil	£2,720
Secondary per pupil	£3,944 (maybe split by KS3 & KS4)
Deprivation per Ever-6 FSM	£2,855
Low Prior Attainment per pupil	£456 (to be converted to EYFSP& KS2)
EAL for first year pupil	£295
LAC (but to be reviewed for 14/15)	£0

MFG set by DfE at -1.5% to protect losers & gainers to be capped at +1.5%

Variety of top-up funding rates for specials, PRUs and resource units but seeking to move to a limited range of standardised top-ups in 2014/15

Proposed consultation Your views on school meetings

1. Consultation starts: 17 September 2012
2. Union Meeting: 25 September 2012
3. Heads & Chairs briefings x4 w/c 24 September N, E, S, City/W
4. Governors Evening Briefing w/c 24 September Hereford
5. Early Years Briefing w/c 1 October 2012
6. Strategic Planning Group: 1 October 2012
7. Budget Working Group 4 October 2012
8. Consultation ends: 5 October 2012
9. Schools Forum Meeting: 19 October 2012
10. Cabinet Member Decision: 31 October 2012

MEETING:	SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE:	19 OCTOBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	SCHOOLS FORUM CONSTITUTION
REPORT BY:	GOVERNANCE SERVICES

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To inform the Forum of changes to the Forum's Constitution required by Regulations and guidance from the Department for Education.

Recommendation

THAT: changes to the Forum's Constitution required by Regulations and guidance from the Department for Education be noted.

Key Points Summary

- New Regulations: The Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 came into force on 1 October 2012. New operational and good practice guidance has also been issued. The Forum is complying with the Regulations and guidance.
- There is a key change with regard to voting on the funding formulae. Only schools members (which includes mainstream schools, Academies, special schools and PRUs) and representatives of the Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector will be able to vote on the funding formulae."
- Ministers have announced that they will consider making further changes in the future to the operation of schools forums,

Alternative Options

- 1 The changes reflect the requirements of Regulations and Guidance and are consistent with separate decisions taken in relation to the Forum's membership. No alternative options have therefore been considered as part of the preparation of this report.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 The report informs the Forum of changes to the Forum's Constitution required by Regulations and guidance

Introduction and Background

- 3 The Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 made on 3 September 2012 came into force on 1 October 2012. The Regulations set out how the membership of schools forums should be constituted, requirements relating to meetings of forums and their proceedings and financial issues on which forums must be consulted.
- 4 The attached guidance from the DfE sets out the main changes.
- 5 New operational and good practice guidance has also been issued and circulated separately to Members of the Forum.
- 6 Particular attention is drawn to the provision at Regulation 8 (10) that, “ With regards to voting, the key change is with regard to the funding formulae. Only schools members (which includes mainstream schools, Academies, special schools and PRUs) and representatives of the Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector will be able to vote on the funding formulae.”
- 7 The explanatory memorandum to the Regulations states (para7.9): “Ministers have also announced that they will consider making further changes in the future to the operation of schools forums, which may include setting a maximum cap on the number of members, significant reduction or removal of non-schools members and requiring an independent secretariat to service schools forums.”
- 8 It is noted that in relation to membership the explanatory memorandum notes (para 8.7) that the balance of representation between phases within academies members is to be considered at a future review.

Community Impact

- 9 None

Equality and Human Rights

- 10 No implications.

Financial Implications

- 11 None

Legal Implications

- 12 The Forum is required to act in accordance with Regulations and guidance and is doing so.

Risk Management

- 13 The Forum is complying with Regulations and guidance.

Consultees

- 14 None

Appendices

Guidance note from the Department for Education – Schools Forum Regulations

Background Papers

- None identified.

SCHOOLS FORUM REGULATIONS

1. The main changes to these regulations relate to the membership and proceedings of Schools Forums. The regulations will come into force on 1 October 2012, and Schools Forums will need to be reconstituted for this date.

Membership

2. The requirement that schools and Academies should have broadly proportionate representation according to pupil numbers in each category is maintained (**regulation 4(6)**). There is concern that the composition of Schools Forums has not changed quickly enough to reflect the pace of academy conversions. Local authorities are required to ensure their Schools Forum is compliant with this requirement based on the pupil numbers in each category as of September 2012 and that this is updated as more conversions take place.
3. There is no longer a requirement to have a minimum of 15 people on Schools Forum. Smaller authorities in particular may therefore wish to review the total size of their Schools Forum.
4. Where there is at least one maintained secondary school in an authority, at least one schools member must be a representative of a secondary school (**regulation 4(7)**). This is consistent with the arrangements for Academies, maintained nursery schools, maintained special schools and maintained Pupil Referral Units. Many authorities now have very few maintained secondary schools, so this will provide minimum representation as with other minority types of school.
5. In order to reflect their status of having a delegated budget from April 2013, where the authority maintains one or more Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) they are required to have a representative on the Schools Forum, who counts as a schools member (**regulations 4(10) and 5(2)(e)**).
6. Among the members representing maintained schools, at least one must be a representative of governing bodies and at least one must be a representative of headteachers (**regulation 4(5)**). This is a requirement of the primary legislation but has not previously been made explicit in the regulations.

Proceedings

7. There will be a restriction on local authority members and officers who are not members of the Schools Forum taking part in its meetings (**regulation 8(4)**). Participation will be limited to a Lead Member for education, children's services or resources, Director of Children's Services (or their representative), Chief Finance Officer (or their representative) or officers who are providing specific financial or technical advice to Schools Forum. Other officers will be able to participate where they are presenting a report, but their participation must be limited to their specific agenda item.
8. The Education Funding Agency (EFA) has been granted observer status at Schools Forum meetings (**regulation 8(4)(f)**). This will provide support to the local process and provide a national perspective if members think it helpful.
9. With regards to voting, the key change is with regard to the funding formulae. Only schools members (which includes mainstream schools, Academies, special schools and PRUs) and representatives of the Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector will be able to vote on the funding formulae (**regulation 8(10)**).

10. Additional requirements for the transparency of Schools Forum include holding all Schools Forum meetings in public and publishing Schools Forum papers, minutes and decisions in public areas of the local authority website (**regulations 8(2) and 8(13)**).
11. In order to reflect the complete delegation of funding for some services, the requirement to consult Schools Forums annually about arrangements for free school meals and insurance has been removed.

For further information on these regulations, please contact the Funding Reform Team at reformteam.funding@education.gsi.gov.uk .

MEETING:	SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE:	19 OCTOBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	REPORT OF THE BUDGET WORKING GROUP
REPORT BY	GOVERNANCE SERVICES

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To consider a report from the Budget Working Group (BWG) on the following issue: National Schools Funding Formula.

Recommendation(s)

- That (a) **subject to the final outcome of responses to the Authority's consultation document on the National School Funding Formula, the Forum be recommended to approve the proposals for the local application of the Formula as set out at Appendix 1 to the report for recommendation to the Cabinet Member – Education and Infrastructure; and**
- (b) **that in the interim, the funding formula values, as set out in Appendix 1, be submitted to the Education Funding Agency by the deadline of 31st October marked "pending cabinet member approval" as necessary.**

Key Points Summary

- The BWG has considered the responses received to the consultation paper for Herefordshire Schools on the local application of the National Schools Funding Formula (NSFF) 2013/14. As the BWG met on 4 October and the closing date for consultation was on 5 October the BWG's recommendations were made subject to review in the event that there are any material changes to the pattern of responses presented to the BWG. There are no material changes to report.
- There were very few areas where the responses to the consultation suggested any disagreement.
- The BWG gave particular consideration to mitigation of the impact on schools of having to find £6,000 for each Band 3 & 4 pupil who are currently largely fully funded for many primary

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Malcolm Green Senior Finance Manager or (for administrative information) Tim Brown, Governance Services on (01432) 260239

schools. The BWG supports a proposal that a Minimum Funding Guarantee style protection scheme should be adopted based on limiting additional school expenditure on High Needs (Band 3 & 4) pupils to 1.5% per pupil. To fund the costs of protection it is proposed to reduce the cap on schools gaining from 1.52% to 0.94%. The cost of protection would be a budget transfer to the high needs block

- The financial values for the national school funding formula must be submitted to the Education Funding Agency by 31st October 2012. The final values must be confirmed in late December after any necessary minor adjustments due to confirmation of the final Dedicated Schools Grant. The consultation paper identified an expected reduction in the per pupil funding of £4 per pupil and the use of the lump sum from Holme Lacy primary school to fund projected growth in special school places.

Alternative Options

- 1 The consultation paper set out a number of alternatives. No alternative options are proposed by the BWG. There are a number of options open to the Forum.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 To consider the BWG's views on the response to the consultation paper for Herefordshire Schools and the local application of the National Schools Funding Formula (NSFF),

Introduction and Background

- 3 On 6 July 2012 the Forum agreed the adoption of a number of principles to guide the preparation of the 2013/14 schools budget.
- 4 The BWG met in May, June and July to develop the funding proposals and again on 6 September to finalise the consultation paper on the local application of the National Schools Funding Formula (NSFF). The consultation document was issued on 10 September. The BWG met again on 4 October to consider the response to the consultation document. The closing date was 5 October. The BWG emphasised that its recommendations were subject to review in the event that there are any material changes to the pattern of responses presented to the BWG. Copies of the Notes of these meetings are being circulated separately to Members of the Forum.
- 5 The final responses to the consultation exercise are set out at Appendix 2 showing the final responses received and Appendix 3 summarises all of the comments received. There are no material changes to report from the information presented to the BWG on 4 October. The BWG's recommendations are in line with the views of the majority of respondents in each case. In relation to Q4 prior attainment (proxy SEN) and Q7pupil mobility the BWG recommends that the position be reviewed after one year.
- 6 The BWG wished to highlight to the Forum the apparent lack of engagement with the consultation process either through attendance at the consultation events or through submission of responses. The BWG considered that this was a matter of concern given the long term implications of these funding changes.

Special Educational Needs Funding

- 7 The NSSF entails significant changes to the funding of special educational needs. The BWG gave particular consideration to mitigation of the impact on schools of having to allocate £6,000 for each Band 3 & 4 pupil who are currently fully funded for most primary schools. This was an emerging theme through the school budget consultation meetings.(Larger primary

schools already have to contribute to the costs of Band 3 pupils as funding is partially delegated on a sliding scale). Four band 4 pupils in a school would lead to additional expenditure of £24,000 (i.e. 4x £6,000).

- 8 A reduction in school budget i.e. income is protected by the Minimum Funding Guarantee of - 1.5% per pupil. Additional expenditure incurred by the school on SEN pupils is not protected by the MFG as it is additional expenditure and not income although the impact is the same.
- 9 The BWG supports a proposal to adopt a similar “MFG” style protection scheme based on limiting additional school expenditure on Band 3 & 4 pupils to 1.5% per pupil.
- 10 The average per pupil funding for primary pupils is approx £4,000 and using this figure as a standard for all schools this per pupil funding amount converts to a maximum reduction of £60 per pupil at the MFG percentage of 1.5% in 2013/14. It is proposed to limit any primary school’s extra SEN costs as follows

Number of primary pupils	Maximum cost of “£6,000” SEN – primary schools
50	£3,000
100	£6,000
150	£9,000
200	£12,000
250	£15,000
300	£18,000
400	£24,000
500	£30,000
600	£36,000

- 11 The additional cost would be £175,000 in 2013/14 and would protect 20 primary schools. To fund the costs of protection it is proposed to reduce the cap on schools gaining from 1.52% to 0.94%. The reduction in the gains cap was original expected to be 1.05% but has had to be tightened further to 0.94% to fund the pupil mobility funding transfer to the high needs block. The cost of protection would be met from a budget transfer of £175,000 to the high needs block.
- 12 In line with the MFG in 2014/15, the % would become a cumulative 3% and so the table would be based on £120 per pupil. 9 schools would receive a total of £48,000 protection. In 2015/16 it is likely that the cumulative MFG would increase to 5% and 3 schools would receive protection at a cost of £12,000.
- 13 Full details of how the protection proposals are set out in Appendix 4 – attached.

Community Impact

14 No direct impact.

Financial Implications

15 The recommendations, if agreed, will not have an impact on the overall Dedicated Schools Grant as the funding charges will pass directly between schools.

Legal Implications

16 The proposals comply with the Council's legal duties and the legal duties of schools.

Risk Management

17 The BWG reviews proposals in detail prior to making recommendations to Schools Forum. This two stage process helps to ensure greater scrutiny of budget proposals.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Proposals for the local application of the National Schools Funding Formula

Appendix 2 – Summary of Responses to the Consultation Paper

Appendix 3 - Comments Received in response to the consultation

Appendix 4 – Details of protection proposals with regard to SEN funding

Background Papers

None

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BUDGET WORKING GROUP TO SCHOOLS FORUM -19 OCTOBER 2012 - NATIONAL SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA

- a) **Basic entitlement - that the basic per pupil entitlement for primary pupils should be set at £2,756 for each pupil (but subject to a £3 per pupil reduction if (h) below is approved);**
- b) **Basic entitlement - that the basic per pupil entitlement for secondary pupils should be split between KS3 and KS4 to represent the higher costs at KS4. Funding rates would be £3,605 for KS3 pupils and £4,543 for KS4 pupils;**
- c) **Deprivation - that the deprivation indicator should be an allocation of £2,848 for every pupil on the “Ever-6” Free Schools Meals;**
- d) **Looked after children - there should be an additional allocation of £900 for each looked after pupil in 2013/14 in order to match the pupil premium;**
- e) **Prior Attainment - there should be a basic entitlement of £228 for each primary pupil with less than 78 points EYFP and £355 for each secondary pupil not achieving level 4 or above in both maths and English at Key Stage 2 for 2013/14 only, and given potential DfE changes subject to review thereafter;**
- f) **English as an Additional Language - there should be an allocation of £405 for each pupil in the first year only with English as an Additional Language in order to match funding allocated in 2012/13**
- g) **Lump Sum - there should be a lump sum allocation for all schools of £105,000 to fairly represent school fixed costs**
- h) **Pupil mobility - there should be a budget in the High Needs Block of £62,800 to support inclusion of hard to place pupils to be funded by a standard deduction of £3 per pupil from all schools with the impact to be reviewed after one year;**
- i) **Split site costs - there should be no split site allocation in line with the current local school funding formula;**
- j) **Business rates - that, as determined by the DfE, the existing method that business rates are allocated at actual cost should be continued;**
- k) **PFI contracts - that as determined by the DfE, the existing allocation of £190,000 to Whitecross to meet PFI contractual commitments and to be indexed annually in future as per RPI should be continued;**
- l) **Notional SEN - the Notional SEN budget should be consistent with previous Herefordshire practice and based on 6% of the per-pupil funding + 6% of the lump sum + 40% of deprivation funding (Ever-6 Free School Meals) + 100% of prior attainment (as a proxy measure for SEN);**
- m) **De-delegation- retention of funding centrally for trade union facilities time and free school meals assessment be supported;**
- n) **De-delegation - the retention of funding centrally for Ethnic minority support be supported;**

- o) Special school funding - As an interim measure in 2013/14, the funding of special schools on the principle of “maintaining budget stability” by determining the top-up funding according to the existing tariff of standard and enhanced pupil needs for the agreed number of commissioned places be supported;**
- p) Special school additional places - Additional places in excess of the agreed number of places if needed, will be funded at marginal cost as determined by the school’s ability to meet the needs of the pupil;**
- q) PRU funding – Herefordshire model - the continuation of a Herefordshire model whereby high schools contribute a £4,325 p.a. fee for every PRU placement be supported; and**
- r) SEN protection - additional school expenditure on Band 3 & 4 pupils be limited to 1.5% per pupil to be funded by reducing the cap on schools gaining from 1.52% to 0.94% (originally 1.05%) as set out in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the report and.**

Note: Only School members of Forum can vote on the national school funding formula proposals and for items (m) & (n) voting is restricted to locally maintained schools only.

NATIONAL SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA HEREFORDSHIRE CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

Please complete the response form by filling in the columns below.

Final Replies

Q1: BASIC PER-PUPIL ENTITLEMENT	Yes	No
Do you agree that the basic per pupil entitlement for primary pupils should be set at £2,756 for each pupil?	21	2
	Yes	No
Do you agree that the basic per pupil entitlement for secondary pupils should be set at £3,982 for each pupil?	14	2

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q1a: HIGH SCHOOLS ONLY KS3 & KS4 FUNDING - Alternative (PRIMARY)	Yes	No
Do you agree that the basic per pupil entitlement for secondary pupils should be split between KS3 and KS4 to represent the higher costs at KS4? Funding rates would be £3,605 for KS3 pupils and £4,543 for KS4 pupils.	3	1

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q1a: HIGH SCHOOLS ONLY KS3 & KS4 FUNDING - Alternative (SECONDARY)	Yes	No
Do you agree that the basic per pupil entitlement for secondary pupils should be split between KS3 and KS4 to represent the higher costs at KS4? Funding rates would be £3,605 for KS3 pupils and £4,543 for KS4 pupils.	5	4

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q2: DEPRIVATION	Yes	No
Do you agree that the deprivation indicator should be an allocation of £2,848 for every pupil on the "Ever-6" Free Schools Meals?	21	1

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q3: LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN	Yes	No
Do you agree that there should be an additional allocation of £900 for each looked after pupil in 2013/14 in order to match the pupil premium?	22	1

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q4: PRIOR ATTAINMENT (PROXY SEN)	Yes	No
Do you agree a basic entitlement of £228 for each primary pupil with less than 78 points EYFP and £355 for each secondary pupil not achieving level 4 or above in both maths and English at Key Stage 2?	16	6

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q4: PRIOR ATTAINMENT (PROXY SEN) – Alternative	Yes	No
Do you agree a basic entitlement of £319 for each primary pupil with less than 73 points EYFP and £355 for each secondary pupil not achieving level 4 or above in both maths and English at Key Stage 2?	8	8

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q5: ENGLISH ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE	Yes	No
Do you agree that there should be an allocation of £405 for each pupil in the first year only with English as an Additional Language in order to match funding allocated in 2012/13?	15	5

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q5: ENGLISH ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE – Alternative 1	Yes	No
Do you agree that there should be an allocation of £167 for each primary pupil and £257 for each secondary pupil for the first two years only with English as an Additional Language in order to match funding allocated in 2012/13?	7	8

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q5: ENGLISH ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE – Alternative 2	Yes	No
Do you agree that there should be an allocation of £100 for each primary pupil and £175 for each secondary pupil in the first three years only with English as an Additional Language in order to match funding allocated in 2012/13?	4	12

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q6: LUMP SUM	Yes	No
Do you agree that there should be a lump sum allocation for all schools of £105,000 to fairly represent school fixed costs?	21	2

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q7: PUPIL MOBILITY – OPTION 1	Yes	No
Do you agree there should be an additional allocation of £200 for each mobile pupil (as set out in the consultation paper) at a cost of £356,725 to be funded by a per-pupil deduction of £23 per primary pupil and £9 per secondary pupil applied to all schools?	8	12

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q7: PUPIL MOBILITY – OPTION 2	Yes	No
Do you agree there should be a budget in the High Needs Block of £62,800 to support inclusion of hard to place pupils to be funded by a standard deduction of £3 per pupil from all schools?	16	5

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q8: SPLIT SITE COSTS	Yes	No
-----------------------------	------------	-----------

Do you agree that there should be no split site allocation in line with the current local school funding formula?	17	0
---	----	---

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q9: BUSINESS RATES	Yes	No
Do you agree that, as determined by the DfE, the existing method that business rates are allocated at actual cost should be continued?	22	0

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q10: PFI CONTRACTS	Yes	No
Do you agree, that as determined by the DfE, the existing allocation of £190,000 to Whitecross to meet PFI contractual commitments and to be indexed annually in future as per RPI should be continued?	17	3

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q11: NOTIONAL SEN BUDGET	Yes	No
Do you agree the Notional SEN budget should be consistent with previous Herefordshire practice and based on 6% of the per-pupil funding + 6% of the lump sum + 40% of deprivation funding (Ever-6 Free School Meals) + 100% of prior attainment (as a proxy measure for SEN)?	21	1

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q12: OPTIONAL DE-DELEGATION (FOR LOCALLY MAINTAINED SCHOOLS ONLY)	Yes	No
Do you support retention of funding centrally for trade union facilities time and free school meals assessment?	17	1
	Yes	No
Do you support the retention of funding centrally for Ethnic minority support?	16	2

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q13: SPECIAL SCHOOL FUNDING 2013/14	Yes	No
As an interim measure in 2013/14, do you support the funding of special schools on the principle of "maintaining budget stability" by determining the top-up funding according to the existing tariff of standard and enhanced pupil needs for the agreed number of commissioned places?	20	0
	Yes	No
Additional places in excess of the agreed number of places if needed, will be funded at marginal cost as determined by the schools ability to meet the needs of the pupil?	15	0

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q14: PRU FUNDING OPTIONS (FOR HIGH SCHOOLS & PRUs ONLY) (PRIMARY)	Yes	No
Q14 (i): BASIC DfE FUNDING MODEL		
Do you support the basic DfE funding model for PRU where the local authority retains the full top-up of £8,650?	2	0

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q14: PRU FUNDING OPTIONS (FOR HIGH SCHOOLS & PRUs ONLY) (SECONDARY)	Yes	No
Q14 (i): BASIC DfE FUNDING MODEL		
Do you support the basic DfE funding model for PRU where the local authority retains the full top-up of £8,650?	3	7

If 'NO' please explain why:

--

Q14: PRU FUNDING OPTIONS (FOR HIGH SCHOOLS & PRUs ONLY) (PRIMARY)	Yes	No

Q14(ii): HEREFORDSHIRE FUNDING MODEL		
Do you support the continuation of a Herefordshire model whereby high schools contribute a £4,325 p.a. fee for every PRU placement?	1	0

If 'NO' please explain why:

Q14: PRU FUNDING OPTIONS (FOR HIGH SCHOOLS & PRUs ONLY) (SECONDARY)	Yes	No
Q14(ii): HEREFORDSHIRE FUNDING MODEL		
Do you support the continuation of a Herefordshire model whereby high schools contribute a £4,325 p.a. fee for every PRU placement?	8	2

If 'NO' please explain why:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

NAME:	DATE:
SCHOOL:	

Response Form MUST be returned by 5th October 2012 to blewis@herefordshire.gov.uk

Comments from Schools Consultation

Schools were asked to comment where they answered no to any question.

Q1 –BASIC PER-PUPIL ENTITLEMENT– Primary

Reluctantly, latest information indicates there is not an intention to bring Herefordshire in line with national ratios.

Should be equally divided for primary and secondary pupils.

Seems to be a higher differential than necessary.

Smaller schools require more funding than larger schools. The very nature of Herefordshire schools means that there are many smaller schools. Cutting funding could end with closures and then rural communities have the heart ripped out of them. When the Schools goes then often the shop and then it becomes a retirement village.

Q1: BASIC PER-PUPIL ENTITLEMENT – secondary

This does not make it equitable and one single rate allows for mobility, falling rolls etc.

But no more than this for secondary pupils.

Generally a high school experiences a higher level of costs for KS4 pupils with exam fees, etc.

We do not agree that this is a sufficiently high baseline figure to allow small schools to operate effectively in the context of so much other revenue being lost.

Referring to page 4 of the Consultation and paragraph 2.12, mainstream schools are expected to contribute the first £6,000 of additional educational support.

Q1a: HIGH SCHOOLS ONLY KS3 & KS4 FUNDING - Alternative

I am not sure that year 7-8 pupils cost much more than a year 6 pupils why should they have more. I do agree 6th form student should have more funding.

We would prefer a flat rate across key stage 3 & 4 and a higher baseline figure.

This is £9 less over five years than the Basic Option above

The indicative NSFF allocation shows an average of £ 5,378 per pupil at EMC but due to the capping of formula introduction this would not be achieved in Year 1. (Approx £167 per pupil would be capped)

Q2: DEPRIVATION

At our school the number of children needing support because of unsupportive family backgrounds currently rests at 24%. The FSM Ever-6 formula is not even slightly representative of the cost to us of supporting pupils.

This seems high to me.

Not convinced that Free Schools Meals is an accurate measure of a child's ability to learn and/or achieve. FSM is not an intelligence standard but an indication of family circumstances.

Given that an allocation has to be made and my thoughts are unlikely to be discussed at parliamentary level I agree with the proposal!!

Governors wished to comment that it was important to be able to consider the needs of other vulnerable children who do not fall into the FSM category.

EMC Estimated at £285,000 – 566 High School Pupils (40% is £ 114,000 Notional SEN portion).

Q3: LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN

This seems low to me in comparison with FSM.

LAC in my school don't trigger FSM money (Pupil Premium). Where this happens the amount for LAC should be the same as pupil premium

Q4: PRIOR ATTAINMENT (PROXY SEN)

This seems about right.

I feel secondary school funding is fair but I feel that using child performance to judge funding at end of EYFS will encourage children's progress to be kept low to get increased funding.

I feel secondary school funding is fair but I feel that using child performance to judge funding at end of EYFS will encourage children's progress to be kept low to get increased funding.

How long will this money follow children for? One year? Every year? At face value, amount not significant enough to be able to make a difference.

This will mean more children will have an entitlement to funding with more so as a school I can use the funding to support more pupils.

For secondary – yes. It is for primaries to decide the other.

The alternative option seems a fairer system with more funding for a lower points score.

We are not satisfied that this is a fair way of assessing this funding. Students from Wales and in some private schools do not always have SAT test scores or even Teacher Assessments and they are not included in calculations. This leaves some schools at a disadvantage. £355 per student is insufficient funding to make a real difference in literacy and numeracy figures within one year.

These rates per pupil do not appear to be based upon any provision costs (ie. An hour of staffing at HC3 per week for instance) The unit figures are merely used to distribute a finite total across all the County Schools.

Entitlement should be for the higher needs children – see below.

Q4: PRIOR ATTAINMENT (PROXY SEN) – alternative

Prefer the alternative below. Pupils with 78 points EYFSP can usually make up the ground with a much smaller amount of individual tuition.

This seems about right.

We feel that £228 is adequate.

I don't agree with 'no pay' if your cohort achieves well. This appears to incentivise low achievement in the EYFS and penalise those setting that achieve well over time. Both systems are wholly unfair and wrong. However, I've chosen the first option as it benefits our current Summer data best!

Fewer children would receive funding with an EYFS 73 points.

But what about next year? What will we use as prior attainment?

We cannot use end of YR results! There is no incentive to do a good job in YR!!

We could see results decrease across the county!

Q5: ENGLISH ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE

The needs of these children vary a great deal and for those who need ongoing support it would be better to have the budget spread over a longer period.

English as an Additional Language – I think there are many of our schools that would benefit from a little more support for this – it is so important for integration of

incoming communities, and also for our economic development as a county. The funding needs to be flexible too – so that it can be put in place very quickly when required.

EAL students need as much help as possible. Funds tend to get spent quickly.

Possible that schools could use all the funding in the 12 months and still need additional [non available] support.

Having not worked with children with EAL I am unsure that I am able to comment on this. I don't not know if it is better to have one bigger year of funding or funding for 3.

This is insufficient funding to support the academic, social and emotional needs of these potentially vulnerable children.

We do not support the reallocation of Specialist School funding, even amongst High Schools, when schools have spent considerable time, effort and money to bid for funds.

£105,000 is insufficient funding to compensate for other cuts in funding to small and rural schools. If this amount is intended to offset unavoidable running costs for small schools (eg Head teachers etc) then why should the same amount be paid to each school in a federation or similar where there is shared HT provision?

Primary schools often have smaller premises and fewer staffing needs than secondary schools; we do not feel that a flat rate is fair.

In addition we do NOT support the funding of any Free Schools in the county and feel it is to the serious detriment of existing provision in other schools.

This would defray costs of establishing EAL pupils in school, translation services, dictionary and resources purchased. But takes no account of casual admissions after Census day.

Q5: ENGLISH ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE – Alternative 1

The biggest rate of progress should be seen in the first year. If not then assessment for additional needs must be proceeded.

More time should be given to students to assimilate English. One year's intensive work is not enough. Staff need to be given time to identify any learning barriers or needs and then have an opportunity to act upon it.

Enables schools to plan additional resources over a more appropriate time scale.

Alternative 2 is simpler.

I feel that all EAL children should receive the same amount of funding when joining our education system irrespective of age.

Prefer the alternative below. More protracted support than one year is usually required.

Our data shows that EAL children make the most progress with English in the first year of school. Therefore a block of funding at the start would help to support them best.

Funding up front for the first year allows for intensive support when it will make most difference – unless the two years span primary secondary when funding might be split to support the transition.

Q5 – first option was preferred.

Q5: ENGLISH ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE – Alternative 2

Two years funding should be sufficient.

Too long and support could not be intensive enough.

This time scale is too long and doesn't 'force' the school to focus the resource accurately.

Q6: LUMP SUM

Seems about right, but I would go for a bit less - maybe £90K.

Governors wished to express a concern that this may discourage potential federations between schools.

Differential running cost and teaching costs for different phases and sizes of school, e.g. specialist equipment for specialist subject teaching means that high schools need more lump sum funding than primary schools. Similarly a small primary school does not need the same lump sum funding as a larger primary school and in turn a larger high school needs more funding than a smaller one. Funding should follow the students.

Although this could be reduced to £100K to create a higher buffer for high needs.

We agree a lump sum should be given, but give a lower amount to every school so that the difference between the suggested lump sum and the revised amount can be pooled. The pooled money can create an SEN fund which can then be reallocated to schools but based on SEN measures, perhaps attached to the number of statemented children in a mainstream school.

This is neither site specific or equivalent to the cost of a "standard" premises staff team. If there is a need to reduce total funding allocated to schools then cutting this back by £5,000 tranches over the next 5 years would be a clear mechanism for moving resources from the Primary Schools sector to the Secondary Schools.

Q7: PUPIL MOBILITY – OPTION 1

The deduction of this money would not help a number of schools because the pay back would be less than the cost.

A little bit on the fence with this one! The reduction of £23 per pupil is not going to make a huge difference to the budget and we do have a high proportion of mobile pupils, but I don't think it would make a great deal of difference either way.

Option 1 and 2 appear to be about different groups of children?

The second option is better as it will allow primary schools a better chance to “put things right” before students come to secondary school. We should as a Herefordshire family of schools support this.

Most 'mobile pupils' will be disadvantaged by this measure as only a very few schools with exceptionally high numbers of in-year transfers will be 'better off'. The overwhelming majority of schools will lose more from (£23xnumber on roll) than they will gain from (£200x number of mobile pupils). If the majority of mobile pupils are in the schools, which are net losers then the majority of mobile pupils will paradoxically be disadvantaged by this proposal.

Laudable principle but counter productive mechanism.

The results of this consultation will incur merging of schools, so mobility will become a greater issue.

We feel that more schools, especially of our size, would lose out by opting for additional allocation.

The loss per pupil would necessitate a large influx of pupils to ever allow the school to break even.

We cannot afford to lose £23 per pupil.

We have relatively low mobility - our long term loss would be £1738.

School would have to have a large number of pupils moving to make this worth while. For most schools this is not an issue.

The loss of £9 per pupil (on our figures) against the percentage of students who are mobile is too high to justify this additional allocation. Not every mobile student has high needs – if they do then High Needs is the appropriate source.

Smaller schools would be at a loss financially on this proposal, as the initial budgets would be cut to subsidise the pupil mobility funding pot.

This is not cost effective for us – the amount paid out is unlikely to be recouped. £200 is an insufficient amount for what could be almost a year's provision of services until the next financial year.

Cost is £9 x 586 = £ 5,274 on the draft figures. That's more than 26 casual admissions a year. It is not clear whether this would be at all beneficial to EMC.

Disproportionate funding of the £200.

Q7: PUPIL MOBILITY – OPTION 2

We are against the principle of the LA deduction from school budgets and holding pots of money which they are allocated according to their criteria.

This seems a fairer way of supporting pupil mobility however would this amount be enough?

There are advantages and disadvantages to both options, but I wouldn't go for either.

For SEN, transportation is likely to be more in demand as pupil numbers rise. The geographical spread of pupils will become greater.

I would want to examine the criteria for accessing such funding before agreeing to this proposal.

Option 1 and 2 are not comparable and therefore don't form a logical choice option.

Not comparable to option 1 – different thing altogether.

However this would be preferable to option 1 so if an either/or then yes to option 2.

We would prefer to have control over our funding and easier access to intervention places of our choice.

Cost to EMC £ 1,758

Q8: SPLIT SITE COSTS

Split site (Q8) – I'm concerned as to whether there being no split site allocation might penalise schools that are federating and finding other ways of working collaboratively and co-operatively. These would seem to be ways of working that we should be encouraging and incentivising rather than penalising.

Q9: BUSINESS RATES

The Business Rates at EMC are the highest in the County. This policy ensures that whatever the amount of Business Rates the cost is zero to the Education budget.

Q10: PFI CONTRACTS

PFI should never be seen as an option for schools (or hospitals)! We are not here to make profit but to educate for the future. It is becoming increasingly difficult to do this in a time where we should be competing with the BRIC countries, not trailing miserably behind.

It should be reduced and some of the cost should be met by Whitecross school.

All schools have supported this cost for a long time out of the DSG it should not come from there as it replaces council stock, it should be the council responsibility.

Iniquitous.

In so far as this could be met from Council funds – not DSG.

However if/when Whitecross convert to an academy we are assuming the LA are no longer responsible for funding this cost as the PFI contractual commitments would be transferred with the change in ownership in becoming an academy.

If the LA is responsible for continuing this funding once the school is an academy, we would disagree with this allocation.

Applies only to Whitecross High School

Q11: NOTIONAL SEN BUDGET

I feel that this is going to push schools to not admit pupils who could be offered a place in a special school because they cannot afford to. I believe passionately in inclusion and in raising standards for children. This budget will adversely affect both.

Governor comments: Agree in principle but for those children who do not meet the criteria there needs to be a mechanism in place to draw down funding. SEN children may not be eligible for FSM funding but 40% of funding still drawn from this pot.

I fundamentally disagree with devolved SEN funding . Money should be attached to pupils not schools. The council should have a clear a fair system for allocating funding to school with pupils with need. How is it right for schools with no SEN pupils to gain money? When schools with large numbers of SEN pupils loose out at a cost to the main stream children. This could lead to schools trying to avoid taking band 4 pupils.

Funding should follow the student. Lump sum funding does not reflect student need in each school.

We do not feel that funding is set at a sufficiently high level and are concerned at the loss of banded funding and the ability to apply for in-year funding for serious cases of need.

This element of the formulae must be very clearly described as having no link to the Additional Pupil Premium money.

The Notional SEN Budget is not extra money, it is a percentage of the source formulae allocations.

Q12A: OPTIONAL DE-DELEGATION (FOR LOCALLY MAINTAINED SCHOOLS ONLY)

I would prefer that the money be delegated to schools.

Schools should be able to choose whether to take up an SLA.

Not for trade unions.

Give funds to schools so they can make the SLA decisions.

Q12B: OPTIONAL DE-DELEGATION (FOR LOCALLY MAINTAINED SCHOOLS ONLY)

No Comments

Q13A: SPECIAL SCHOOL FUNDING 2013/14

No Comments

Q13B: SPECIAL SCHOOL FUNDING 2013/15

No Comments

Q14: PRU FUNDING OPTIONS (FOR HIGH SCHOOLS & PRUs ONLY), Q14 (i): BASIC DfE FUNDING MODEL

This seems fair to me & discourages exclusions.

We would prefer to be able to buy in services as appropriate to the student.

Option 14 (ii) would be more favourable to the vulnerable schools in Herefordshire.

This option would ensure funding is available for LA cases coming into PRU such as out of county students, students currently home educated who need support to return to education, students who have not attended a school for a long period and are not on roll or those coming via Fair Access for example. This option may lead to schools opting for permanent exclusion as there appears to be no cost involved or for schools to feel they have no funding for internal support measures.

The alternative PRU funding option seems more pragmatic.

There are different views between Secondary Schools about how PRU and Special School placements should be financed. High Schools are often left to finance taxi transport to short-term placements whilst pupils are dual-registered. If a pupil is permanently excluded and therefore no longer on the school roll then in following years the school has no income to pay the PRU – see below:

Q14: PRU FUNDING OPTIONS (FOR HIGH SCHOOLS & PRUs ONLY). Q14(ii): HEREFORDSHIRE FUNDING MODEL

This would ensure schools can make a choice of placement and that they have funds for internal support. This option may cause PRUs to not have a clear enough idea of year to year budgets.

Why is this extra funding needed? The APWU follows the student so funding should come from this.

Pupil Referral Units are funded to provide a set number of places. So a charge on High Schools is a dis-incentive to referring a pupil to a PRU that would meet their needs. However if our intervention costs were likely to exceed the Pupil Allocation (Average £ 5,378) then this option becomes attractive if it encourages the PRU to provide for an additional pupil above their capacity.

I am writing to express the serious concerns of the Senior Leadership about the impact of Pupil Referral Unit charging proposals outlined in paragraphs 5.16 to 5.18 in the consultation document.

Whilst 5.17 explains that by delegating funds, schools have a choice about the style and location of intervention, the position after a pupil has been permanently excluded and taken off roll is not clearly set out. An initial pro-rata charge during that financial year ONLY, should be approved.

When a pupil is taken off roll the allocation of money for that pupil stops at the end of the financial year following the census recording that change. Therefore the school has no funds to continue a Pupil Referral Unit placement into a further financial year.

The Herefordshire Funding Model needs to reflect:

“There would be no charge to schools for PRU placement following permanent exclusion”

Please ensure that this slight amendment preserves a fair funding arrangement.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

With the mobility measure it is clear to see what the cost of the measure is to the per-pupil allocation and what the gain would be. It would be interesting to explore this ratio on the other redistribution mechanisms. What is the cost of the other measures to the basic pupil entitlement and how many schools will gain more than they lose? Are we sure, for example, that the majority of LAC will be in schools which are net beneficiaries of this funding redistribution device? If not then the mechanism will 'harm' more 'LAC' than it will help.

Small schools – I'd like to see greater weighting given to keeping our smaller schools financially viable – the rural sparsity of our county is well-attested, and there are so many good reasons to keep our small schools functioning at the centre of their communities. The nature of our county means we must accept this as cost to be borne. Is there not some kind of measure for rural sparsity that can be used to allow additional funding for schools identified as being in this category?

It is pleasing to see funding directed towards genuine rather than notional deprivation so that areas excluded from the Excellence Cluster but with high needs children, such as Leominster, will now benefit. This is overdue and welcome.

On the whole this seems a very fair distribution of funds. Thank you

We are concerned that changes to SEN funding will affect small schools with higher numbers of SEN funded children.

Herefordshire faces an acute challenge with so many small schools who will in time be significantly affected by the elimination of their small school subsidy. We need to find a way to sustain our rural education system in these difficult financial circumstances otherwise there will be many more children commuting longer and longer distances to schools in and around the market towns. These funding changes make this an even more urgent priority.

The figures on the spread-sheet draw attention to the amount any given school might *lose* or *gain*. This figure *must* be considered alongside the overall changes to the per-pupil funding levels and careful consideration should be made of how this figure compares with other schools in Herefordshire and beyond. Many of the 'losers' in absolute terms will still be funded at relatively high levels on a per-pupil basis.

It is interesting and important to note that if the amount of funding per pupil invested in a school was directly proportionate to the levels of progress and attainment in that school, then St. Paul's would have the lowest achievement levels in the county. I can confirm that it does not.

Early intervention – I would suggest that the earlier intervention takes place, the better it is, including cost effectiveness, so I would like to see a little more financial weight given to Early Years Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1- for some children even intervention at age 4 is too late. Also, earlier intervention (say on reading skills, engagement with education etc) should have a knock-on effect for later schooling. My principle would be “more help sooner”. These comments apply to SEN as well.

As a broad principle it can be counter-productive to reduce these figures to skew funding towards particular groups of children. By doing so many schools receive a net reduction in funding and find it harder to support the groups of children who are intended to benefit from these mechanisms. There is a limit the economies of scale, which can be achieved in larger schools.

When will we hear the composite results of this survey?
Some questions were difficult to answer in the absence of information about how /where the money would otherwise be used.

Concern about the £6k coming out of school budgets for Band 3&4 children. This will impact severely on rural small primary schools.
Also very concerned about the primary/secondary funding ratio moving from 1:1.75 to national average of 1:1.27 which will reduce the primary school lump sum by £25k - equivalent to a teacher's salary.

Hope this meets you in time as we note that in fact there is a meeting on the 4th, yet the response is due for 5th October!

This form doesn't present much choice in terms of how we are consulted about our funding. The main thing that currently concerns our school is the 'equalisation' of funding ratios between primary and secondary settings. The potential for primary settings to lose approximately £25,000 from our lump sum, to fund secondary settings to receive the 'average' ratio is potentially devastating for small primary schools. I do not believe that this should take place and the current funding ratio should be maintained.

Herefordshire is the third worst funded LEA and you should be campaigning for more funding not making cuts to schools. I do not believe we should accept this policy. Herefordshire should be at the heart of a campaign that draws together all those similar rural LA's. A fairer funding system should be about fairer funding to LA's, Harmonisation of funding depending on the socio economic, deprivation factors, urban, rural costs etc of the LA as a whole. Similar schools across the country should receive similar funding.

I believe the Local authority should refuse to implement this funding formula and make a stance against this policy in the Media and with the local MPs. If in the end we are forced into doing this then the basic block funding should be much larger to

enable smaller schools to survive and critically give each child an entitlement to a good education in a local area without putting four year olds on buses and destroying the rural communities that make up most of our County. Schools will need to evolve and change and we all need to plan this. However any changes should not be detrimental to the rural communities who are at the heart of our county . Larger Urban schools that are close to capacity have more resources now than the smaller schools so this will just widen the gap between rural and city school and make for more inequalities not harmonisation. Urban schools who are operating with a large numbers of places should be reviewed.

Funding for Special Needs should not be devolved in anyway. All funding should be kept by the local authority with a clear criteria to support the most needy pupils in our communities. This is even more critical for the most needy pupils Band 4. We do not want a two tier system of schools with the most needy pupils being forced in to a lottery of which school accepts them or even worse they end up in special schools when they could with funding be in the main stream. Schools without SEN pupils should not gain at the cost of those who do. Nor should mainstream children miss out fund SEN. Schools that have worked hard to become outstanding practitioners with many SEN pupils will have huge budget cuts to deal with. The more SEN pupils a school has the more funding they should have not less!

Due to the SEN funding being the most contentious issue, we have suggested a different modelling solution within question 6. The lump sum could be reduced in order to fund a SEN 'funding pot' which can be reallocated to schools but based purely on SEN measures. It doesn't have to be complex or involve bidding, but funding could be attached to the number of statemented children within mainstream schools. This option would help fund these pupils who do have a higher level of needs.

The Head Teacher and Governing Body are dismayed at these proposals which have a potentially devastating effect on our high-performing school, simply because of its small size and geographical location, both of which are significant factors in its enduring success.

Whilst we understand that Herefordshire has not chosen this method of funding schools and is a woefully under-funded county, we cannot endorse a budget which would appear to punish small schools, particularly in the Golden Valley, and leaves us with a potential 8.5% drop in our already limited budget in 2 years time.

We urge the county to go back to central government and represent the very real damage cuts like these will do to our education system and the future of our young people. Herefordshire is fortunate in having a wide variety of educational opportunities, particularly at secondary level, which offer true parental choice and allow young people to receive an excellent education, no matter where they are in the county. Key to this variety are the smaller, more rural schools which offer a different experience from the larger comprehensives. Undermining the financial security of small schools can only lead to a decrease in choices available and an insistence on a "one size fits all" approach.

Fairfield High School has stood for years in Herefordshire with a clear set of principles which focus education on the individual in a nurturing environment which

allows academic ability and creative talent to flourish. This requires proper resourcing and support. Less is not more. Less is less.

Concerns about the Proposed funding formula changes

With regards the Proposed funding formula, my concerns are detailed below. I refer to the funding presentation received from GIH (Oct 1st 2012) and the response I received from Bill Wiggins MP (August 10th 2012) and Sarah Teather MP (August 6th 2012) to my letter to my MP (Bill Wiggins). To put the Minister's response to my letter in context I should add that Edward Timpson MP replaced Sarah Teather in her post in the September re-shuffle of the Cabinet.

1. Ref: Slide 1 Does the LA pick up the funding of the 'Robert Owen Free School'? Is this not a centrally funded development?

2. Ref: Slide 2 Does the time frame for the transition to a national funding formula take account of the changes in SEN provision that will be enshrined in the Children and Families Act currently going through the parliamentary system *but* will become law early in 2013?

3. Ref: Slide 2 *The transition period*: I refer to comments made by Chowdry and Siebeta (Nov 2011) in their publication '*School funding reforms; Empirical Analysis of Options for a national funding formula*' (Institute of Fiscal Studies) The transition to a funding formula any transition period of less than a decade will involve significant, sustained losses for some schools. If phased in over 5 years as proposed, wont this exacerbate problems further in terms of winners and losers?

4. Ref: Slide 4 'de-delegation (retention of funding) for local authority schools' Does this affect Academies?

5. Ref: Slide 6 AND Slide 11. I refer to the draft document Children and Families Act, September 2012. Changes to SEN provision of assessment and funding.
Ref: Sarah Teather: "we intend to require local authorities to set out a local offer of education, health and social care services available to families of children and young people with SEN or who are disabled in their areas".

Ref: Draft Act 6 (1) JOINT COMMISSIONING ARRANGEMENTS

A local authority in England and its partner clinical commissioning groups must make arrangements ("joint commissioning arrangements") about the Education, Health and Care (EHC) provision to be secured for children and young people for whom the authority is responsible who have special educational needs.

(11) Local Offer for children and young people with special educational needs

(13) Children and young people with EHC plans –In a case within section 19(5) or 20(2) local authority must secure that the plan provides for the child or young person to

be educated in a maintained nursery school, mainstream school or mainstream post-16

institution, unless that is incompatible with the wishes of the child's parent or the young person or

b) the provision of efficient education of others.

There is no reference to this proposed 'Local Offer' or the integrated working policies

that underpin both 'Support for Aspiration' or the 'Children and Families Bill'. Should the contributions and deduction cited throughout the presentation document also include

knowledge of a) what contribution will be made by our local health service partners. SEN provision/funding is going to change radically 2013-2015 but the proposed funding formula makes no reference to this. Below I give a summary of the joint commissioning plans.

Joint commissioning: *LAs and clinical commissioning groups would have to put arrangements in place to ensure that services for disabled children and young people,*

and those with SEN are planned and commissioned jointly. This would help ensure that

agencies work together to agree the best package of support as well as avoiding lengthy

disputes over who should pay for services. The Department of Health will, subject to consultation, use the mandate to the NHS Commissioning Board to ensure that the NHS

commissioning system and, in particular, clinical commissioning groups, are focused on

Improved outcomes for disabled children and those with SEN.

The proposed formula does NOT make reference to this 'Joint Commissioning' at all or

the local offer as summarised here:

Local offer: *all LAs would publish a 'local offer' of support, so parents would know exactly what is available instead of having to fight for basic information. It is envisaged*

that all parents would be given details of: early years, school and colleges provision and

transport to and from it; social care services available, including short breaks; health services, including speech and language therapy; how to access specialist support; and

special and specialist school provision available – including training providers and apprenticeships.

6. Ref: Sarah Teather. 'Local authority education and children's services will continue to be able to determine spending in line with local priorities. Similarly schools have freedom to use their resources to raise pupil attainment gaps. From 2013-2014 we are introducing a new system for funding pupils with SEN and Disabilities in schools which should facilitate a closer working relationship between local authority commissioning services for such pupils, and the providers of those services'.

Again, this reinforces the need for service providers to work in partnership, but again, what contributions are our local health service providers making to special education provision? This is not taken into account in the funding proposal.

7. Time frame for consultation My final concern is about the short time frame for consultation. Surely something as important as this warrants an extensive consultation, and across disciplines if the local authority is to be prepared for the changes that will be coming on line after the Draft Act has its first reading and passes through its parliament trajectory?

Appendix 2 National School Funding Formula - Implications for Herefordshire schools

Appendix 4

School number	School name	Pupil at Oct 2011 less High Needs (c)	Post MFG Budget 2013/14 (t)	NSFF Total Allocation (g)	2013/14 National Formula			2013/14 Total			LONG RUN			Protect SEN			Losses after protection n			
					Baseline Budget 2012/13 excl nursery, VI form & IAR (u)	National Increase (+) or Decrease (-) (v)	March 12 Commitments Additional cost of £6,000 or additional SEN support (w)	Estimated Total cost of additional SEN support (x)	NET GAIN (+) TOTAL NET LOSS (-) (z)	Total Change (%) (aa)	TOTAL NET GAIN (+) TOTAL NET LOSS (-) (ab)	Total Change (%) (ac)	Estimated SEN expenditure 2013/14 (£60 per pupil)	Cost of protection	Losses before Protection n					
2001	Almeley Primary	72	£354,103	£349,026	-£2,279	£0	£0	£0	-£2,279	-0.6%	-£7,356	-2.1%	£4,320	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	-£2,279	-£2,279
2005	Ashperton Primary	165	£619,853	£627,276	£10,094	£0	£0	£0	£10,094	1.7%	£17,518	2.9%	£9,900	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
2011	Bredonbury Primary	66	£331,708	£349,988	£5,289	£2,531	£12,000	£14,531	£9,038	2.8%	£9,038	2.8%	£3,960	£14,531	£10,571	£0	£0	£10,571	-£9,243	£1,329
2014	Brockhampton Primary	128	£487,668	£497,028	£7,333	£0	£0	£0	£7,333	1.5%	£16,693	3.5%	£7,680	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
2024	St. Peter's Primary	187	£728,937	£739,240	£13,345	£0	£6,000	£6,000	£7,345	1.0%	£17,648	2.5%	£11,220	£6,000	£6,000	£0	£0	£6,000	£0	£0
2029	Burghill Primary	92	£396,955	£393,545	£3,133	£4,044	£8,022	£12,066	£-15,198	-3.8%	£-18,609	-4.7%	£5,520	£12,066	£6,546	£0	£0	£6,546	-£15,198	-£8,653
2031	Clifford Primary	75	£339,311	£328,626	£-2,713	£0	£2,531	£2,531	£-5,245	-1.5%	£-15,929	-4.7%	£4,500	£2,531	£0	£0	£0	£2,531	-£5,245	-£5,245
2046	Ewyas Harold	120	£489,347	£489,347	£6,033	£2,022	£0	£2,022	£4,011	0.8%	£4,011	0.8%	£7,200	£2,022	£2,022	£0	£0	£2,022	£0	£0
2053	Garway	41	£249,276	£232,346	£-1,601	£0	£6,000	£6,000	£-7,601	-3.0%	£-24,531	-9.8%	£2,460	£6,000	£3,540	£0	£0	£3,540	£-7,601	£-4,061
2056	Broadlands Primary	175	£684,310	£725,517	£12,462	£1,381	£0	£1,381	£11,080	1.6%	£52,287	7.8%	£10,500	£1,381	£0	£0	£0	£1,381	£0	£0
2057	Hampton Dene	222	£790,911	£803,788	£13,274	£1,381	£6,000	£7,381	£5,892	0.8%	£18,769	2.4%	£13,320	£7,381	£0	£0	£0	£7,381	£0	£0
2061	Lord Scudamore	573	£2,010,736	£2,025,390	£40,170	£13,676	£9,353	£23,029	£17,141	0.9%	£31,795	1.6%	£34,380	£23,029	£23,029	£0	£0	£23,029	£0	£0
2063	Marlbrook Primary School	400	£1,786,160	£1,711,821	£-10,717	£6,131	£6,000	£12,131	£-22,848	-1.3%	£-97,187	-5.4%	£24,000	£12,131	£0	£0	£0	£12,131	£-22,848	£-22,848
2067	St Martin's Primary	319	£1,426,803	£1,367,940	£-9,215	£11,063	£14,548	£25,611	£-34,826	-2.4%	£-93,689	-6.5%	£19,140	£25,611	£6,471	£0	£0	£6,471	£-34,826	£-28,355
2071	Trinity Primary School	536	£1,906,021	£1,927,828	£37,079	£18,000	£6,000	£24,000	£13,079	0.7%	£34,885	1.9%	£32,160	£24,000	£24,000	£0	£0	£24,000	£0	£0
2077	Holme Lacy Primary	40	£227,738	£242,091	£125	£0	£0	£0	£125	0.1%	£14,478	6.4%	£2,400	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
2094	Kings Caple	31	£184,840	£194,581	£1,493	£0	£0	£0	£1,493	0.8%	£11,234	6.1%	£1,860	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
2095	Kingstone & Thrupton	160	£658,248	£614,228	£-5,665	£2,531	£0	£2,531	£-8,197	-1.2%	£-52,217	-7.9%	£9,600	£2,531	£0	£0	£0	£2,531	£-8,197	£-8,197
2096	Kington Primary School	201	£766,229	£818,712	£14,646	£13,545	£0	£13,545	£1,100	0.1%	£53,583	7.1%	£12,060	£13,545	£1,485	£0	£0	£1,485	£0	£0
2098	Ledbury Primary	412	£1,484,586	£1,525,075	£28,195	£33,616	£12,000	£45,616	£-17,421	-1.2%	£23,068	1.6%	£24,720	£45,616	£20,896	£0	£0	£20,896	£-17,421	£3,475
2099	Leominster Infant's School	266	£1,130,800	£1,139,019	£23,665	£0	£6,000	£6,000	£17,665	1.6%	£25,884	2.3%	£15,960	£6,000	£0	£0	£0	£6,000	£0	£0
2100	Leominster Junior School	294	£1,242,062	£1,300,923	£27,420	£12,000	£0	£12,000	£15,420	1.3%	£74,281	6.1%	£17,640	£12,000	£0	£0	£0	£12,000	£0	£0
2101	Longtown Primary	56	£280,327	£278,000	£-1,851	£0	£0	£0	£-1,851	-0.7%	£-4,178	-1.5%	£3,360	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£-1,851	£-1,851
2102	Lugwardine	188	£665,501	£665,501	£-419	£2,860	£14,531	£17,392	£-17,811	-2.7%	£-17,811	-2.7%	£11,280	£17,392	£6,112	£0	£0	£6,112	£-17,811	£-11,699
2103	Luston	99	£448,584	£454,881	£7,387	£0	£0	£0	£7,387	1.7%	£13,684	3.1%	£5,940	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
2104	Madley	198	£748,556	£748,556	£-570	£6,000	£0	£6,000	£-6,570	-0.9%	£-6,570	-0.9%	£11,880	£6,000	£0	£0	£0	£6,000	£-6,570	£-6,570
2115	Marden Primary School	86	£376,648	£358,346	£-3,182	£0	£0	£0	£-3,182	-0.8%	£-21,484	-5.7%	£5,160	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£-3,182	£-3,182
2116	Michaelchurch Escley	57	£295,904	£293,400	£-1,757	£855	£2,548	£3,403	£-5,160	-1.7%	£-7,664	-2.6%	£3,420	£3,403	£0	£0	£0	£3,403	£-5,160	£-5,160
2122	Peterchurch	82	£388,762	£367,864	£-2,971	£2,022	£0	£2,022	£-4,993	-1.3%	£-25,891	-6.6%	£4,920	£2,022	£0	£0	£0	£2,022	£-4,993	£-4,993
2138	Ashfield Park Primary	302	£1,095,489	£1,153,837	£21,206	£8,531	£12,000	£20,531	£675	0.1%	£59,023	5.5%	£18,120	£20,531	£2,411	£0	£0	£2,411	£0	£0
2146	Shobdon	66	£336,590	£337,231	£4,906	£0	£0	£0	£4,906	1.5%	£5,547	1.7%	£3,960	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
2148	Stoke Prior	81	£381,546	£358,541	£-3,002	£4,833	£0	£4,833	£-7,835	-2.0%	£-30,840	-8.0%	£4,860	£4,833	£0	£0	£0	£4,833	£-7,835	£-7,835
2152	St. Weonards	42	£228,745	£240,274	£22,458	£0	£0	£0	£22,458	1.1%	£13,988	6.2%	£2,520	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
2154	Sutton C.P. School	86	£382,034	£366,222	£-3,052	£0	£6,000	£6,000	£-9,052	-2.4%	£-24,864	-6.5%	£5,160	£6,000	£840	£0	£0	£840	£-9,052	£-8,212
2155	Walford Primary School	193	£692,876	£721,177	£11,633	£3,353	£6,000	£9,353	£2,280	0.3%	£30,580	4.5%	£11,580	£9,353	£0	£0	£0	£9,353	£0	£0
2157	Wellington	102	£455,151	£460,122	£7,226	£6,000	£12,000	£18,000	£-10,774	-2.4%	£-5,803	-1.3%	£6,120	£18,000	£11,880	£0	£0	£11,880	£-10,774	£1,106
2158	Weobley Primary	144	£668,181	£696,082	£22,901	£0	£0	£0	£22,901	3.4%	£40,934	6.2%	£8,640	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
2159	Wigmore Primary	140	£555,280	£561,432	£9,226	£0	£6,000	£6,000	£3,226	0.6%	£9,378	1.7%	£6,400	£6,000	£0	£0	£0	£6,000	£0	£0
2160	Withington	60	£280,433	£325,224	£4,039	£0	£0	£0	£4,039	1.5%	£48,830	17.7%	£3,600	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
3006	Bosbury	122	£492,695	£504,413	£7,807	£0	£0	£0	£7,807	1.6%	£19,525	4.0%	£7,320	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
3010	Burley Gate C.E. Primary	91	£414,129	£409,301	£-2,829	£12,000	£0	£12,000	£-14,829	-3.6%	£-19,657	-4.7%	£5,460	£12,000	£6,540	£0	£0	£6,540	£-14,829	£-8,289
3015	Canon Pyon CE Primary	59	£276,906	£298,651	£3,551	£0	£0	£0	£3,551	1.3%	£25,296	9.3%	£3,540	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
3021	Cleonger C.E. Primary	113	£486,648	£461,706	£-4,006	£6,000	£0	£6,000	£-10,006	-2.0%	£-34,947	-7.1%	£6,780	£6,000	£0	£0	£0	£6,000	£-10,006	£-10,006
3023	Colwall C E Primary	171	£623,316	£623,316	£8,946	£0	£6,000	£6,000	£2,946	0.5%	£2,946	0.5%	£10,260	£6,000	£0	£0	£0	£6,000	£0	£0
3026	St Mary's CE, Credenhill	188	£740,806	£740,806	£12,857	£17,063	£12,000	£29,063	£-16,206	-2.2%	£-16,206	-2.2%	£11,280	£29,063	£17,783	£0	£0	£17,783	£-16,206	£1,577
3035	Eardisley	76	£341,908	£344,048	£4,527	£131	£0	£131	£4,396	1.3%	£6,535	1.9%	£4,560	£131	£0	£0	£0	£131	£0	£0
3037	Eastnor Primary School	75	£340,413	£328,281	£-2,727	£0	£0	£0	£-2,727	-0.8%	£-14,859	-4.3%	£4,500	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£-2,727	£-2,727
3046	Goodrich	120	£473,621	£473,621	£-2,436	£0	£12,000	£12,000	£-14,436	-3.0%	£-14,436	-3.0%	£7,200	£12,000	£4,800	£0	£0	£4,800	£-14,436	£-9,636
3047	Gorsley Goffs	182	£676,367	£660,424	£-6,205	£2,531	£4,373	£6,904	£-13,109	-1.9%	£-29,052	-4.3%	£10,920	£6,904	£0	£0	£0	£6,904	£-13,109	£-13,109
3055	Holmer CE Primary	309	£1,047,947	£1,107,569	£19,723	£2,663	£6,000	£8,663	£11,061	1.1%	£70,682	6.9%	£18,540	£8,663	£0	£0	£0	£8,663	£0	£0
3071	Little Dewchurch	51	£285,056	£258,001	£-22,218	£6,000	£0	£6,000	£-8,218	-2.9%	£-35,273	-12.3%	£3,060	£6,000	£2,940	£0	£0	£2,940	£-8,218	£-5,278
3078	Mordiford	138	£521,402	£518,037	£-4,574	£12,789	£0	£12,789	£-17,363	-3.3%	£-20,729	-3.9%	£8,280	£12,789	£4,509	£0	£0	£4,509	£-17,363	£-12,854
3079	Much Birch V.C. School	179	£696,183	£644,240	£-6,730	£8,531	£6,000	£14,531	£-21,261	-3.0%	£-73,204	-10.4%	£10,740	£14,531	£3,791	£0	£0	£3,791	£-21,261	£-17,470

Appendix 4

Appendix 2 National School Funding Formula - Implications for Herefordshire schools

School number	School name	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)	(r)	(s)	(t)	(u)	(v)	(w)	(x)	(y)	(z)	(aa)	(ab)	(ac)
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)	(r)	(s)	(t)	(u)	(v)	(w)	(x)	(y)	(z)	(aa)	(ab)	(ac)		
		(c)	(d)	Pupil at Oct 2011 less High Needs		Post MFG Budget 2013/14	NSFF Total Allocation 2013/14	Budget 2012/13 excl nursery, VI form & IAR		2013/14 National Formula Increase(+) Decrease (-)	March 12 Commitments Additional cost of £6,000 additional SEN support	Band 3	Band 4	Band 4 support	Estimated Total cost of additional SEN support	2013/14 TOTAL NET GAIN (+) TOTAL NET LOSS (-)	Total Change (%)	LONG RUN TOTAL NET GAIN (+) TOTAL NET LOSS (-)	Total Change (%)	Protect SEN expenditure to £60 per pupil 2013/14	Estimated SEN expend	Cost of protection	Losses before Protection	Losses after protection						
3083	Orieton	174	£646,509	£646,509		£646,509	£646,509	£641,078	£5,432	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£5,432	0.8%	£5,432	£5,432	0.8%	£10,440	£0	£0	£0	£0						
3102	Stretton Sugwas C.E.	102	£424,806	£424,806		£424,806	£424,806	£428,423	£3,617	£0	£12,000	£0	£0	£12,000	£15,617	-3.6%	£17,435	£17,435	9.7%	£6,120	£12,000	£5,880	£15,617	£9,737						
3109	Whitbourne CE Primary	29	£180,943	£180,943		£180,943	£180,943	£179,494	£1,449	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1,449	0.8%	£1,449	£1,449	0.8%	£1,740	£0	£0	£0	£0						
3304	Bodenham St. Michael's	104	£403,774	£403,774		£403,774	£403,774	£397,587	£6,187	£509	£0	£0	£0	£509	£5,677	1.4%	£43,102	£43,102	10.8%	£6,240	£509	£0	£0	£0						
3305	Brampton Abbotts C of E.	105	£497,488	£497,488		£497,488	£497,488	£488,188	£9,300	£2,531	£0	£0	£0	£2,531	£6,768	1.4%	£23,038	£23,038	4.7%	£6,300	£2,531	£0	£0	£0						
3307	Bridstow C.E.Primary	87	£378,373	£378,373		£378,373	£378,373	£372,860	£5,513	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£5,513	1.5%	£12,075	£12,075	3.2%	£5,220	£0	£0	£0	£0						
3315	Cradley V.A.	100	£426,798	£426,798		£426,798	£426,798	£422,876	£3,922	£2,531	£0	£0	£0	£2,531	£1,391	0.3%	£1,391	£1,391	0.3%	£6,000	£2,531	£0	£0	£0						
3325	St. Mary's C. of E. (VA)	119	£454,271	£454,271		£454,271	£454,271	£458,327	£4,056	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£4,056	-0.9%	£6,860	£6,860	-1.5%	£7,140	£0	£0	£4,056	£4,056						
3330	Our Lady's RC Primary	178	£727,016	£727,016		£727,016	£727,016	£733,685	£6,668	£8,022	£10,159	£18,181	£18,181	£18,181	£24,849	-3.4%	£102	£102	-11.6%	£10,680	£18,181	£7,501	£24,849	£17,348						
3331	St. Francis Xavier's R.C.	211	£754,415	£754,415		£754,415	£754,415	£749,261	£5,153	£131	£6,000	£6,131	£6,131	£6,131	£9,278	-0.1%	£978	£978	-0.1%	£12,660	£6,131	£0	£9,278	£9,278						
3332	St. James C.E. Primary	185	£664,791	£664,791		£664,791	£664,791	£653,316	£11,475	£2,236	£0	£0	£0	£2,236	£9,239	1.4%	£41,669	£41,669	6.4%	£11,100	£2,236	£0	£0	£0						
3333	St Paul's C. E. Primary	411	£1,321,059	£1,321,059		£1,321,059	£1,321,059	£1,323,245	£2,186	£0	£12,000	£0	£0	£12,000	£14,186	-1.1%	£14,186	£14,186	-1.1%	£24,660	£12,000	£0	£14,186	£14,186						
3341	Kimbolton	91	£372,021	£372,021		£372,021	£372,021	£375,157	£3,136	£6,000	£0	£0	£0	£6,000	£9,136	-2.4%	£12,360	£12,360	-3.3%	£5,460	£6,000	£540	£9,136	£8,596						
3342	Kingsland C E Primary	147	£561,975	£561,975		£561,975	£561,975	£567,089	£5,114	£6,000	£17,063	£23,063	£23,063	£23,063	£28,177	-5.0%	£46,989	£46,989	-8.3%	£8,820	£23,063	£14,243	£28,177	£13,934						
3347	Lea C.E. (Aided) Primary	93	£455,122	£455,122		£455,122	£455,122	£458,491	£3,369	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£3,369	-0.7%	£40,511	£40,511	-8.8%	£5,580	£0	£0	£3,369	£3,369						
3348	Leintwardine Endowed CE	98	£404,609	£404,609		£404,609	£404,609	£408,118	£3,509	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£3,509	-0.9%	£11,271	£11,271	-2.8%	£5,880	£0	£0	£3,509	£3,509						
3349	Ivington C.E.Primary	87	£403,725	£403,725		£403,725	£403,725	£396,570	£7,155	£6,000	£12,000	£18,000	£18,000	£18,000	£10,845	-2.7%	£17,045	£17,045	4.3%	£5,220	£18,000	£12,780	£10,845	£1,935						
3351	Llangrove	37	£196,538	£196,538		£196,538	£196,538	£194,771	£1,767	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1,767	0.9%	£22,650	£22,650	11.6%	£2,220	£0	£0	£0	£0						
3363	Much Marcle CE	94	£418,741	£418,741		£418,741	£418,741	£419,486	£745	£6,000	£18,000	£24,000	£24,000	£24,000	£24,745	-5.9%	£24,745	£24,745	-5.9%	£5,640	£24,000	£18,360	£24,745	£6,385						
3366	Pembridge Primary	105	£423,750	£423,750		£423,750	£423,750	£424,771	£1,021	£2,531	£0	£0	£0	£2,531	£3,552	-0.8%	£3,552	£3,552	-0.8%	£6,300	£2,531	£0	£3,552	£3,552						
3367	Penccombe C.E. Primary	60	£277,251	£277,251		£277,251	£277,251	£277,246	£4	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£4	0.0%	£4	£4	0.0%	£3,600	£0	£0	£0	£0						
3372	St. Joseph's	89	£388,035	£388,035		£388,035	£388,035	£381,989	£6,045	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£6,045	1.6%	£23,085	£23,085	6.0%	£5,340	£0	£0	£0	£0						
3378	Staunton-on-Wye Primary	72	£357,376	£357,376		£357,376	£357,376	£359,792	£2,416	£3,061	£1,878	£4,939	£4,939	£4,939	£7,356	-2.0%	£21,967	£21,967	-6.1%	£4,320	£4,939	£619	£7,356	£6,736						
3384	Weston-Under-Penyard	75	£330,047	£330,047		£330,047	£330,047	£325,552	£4,495	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£4,495	1.4%	£15,030	£15,030	4.6%	£4,500	£0	£0	£0	£0						
3385	Whitchurch	102	£429,907	£429,907		£429,907	£429,907	£430,273	£366	£6,131	£0	£0	£0	£6,131	£6,498	-1.5%	£6,498	£6,498	-1.5%	£6,120	£6,131	£11	£6,498	£6,486						
3392	St Thomas Cantilupe C.E.	186	£728,418	£728,418		£728,418	£728,418	£715,146	£13,272	£6,444	£0	£0	£0	£6,444	£6,828	1.0%	£22,214	£22,214	3.1%	£11,160	£6,444	£0	£0	£0						
3393	Riverside Primary	357	£1,705,846	£1,705,846		£1,705,846	£1,705,846	£1,716,584	£10,738	£21,057	£131	£21,189	£21,189	£21,189	£31,927	-1.9%	£159,647	£159,647	-9.3%	£21,420	£21,189	£0	£31,927	£31,927						
	Primary Totals	11,929	£48,409,088	£48,328,210		£48,328,210	£48,328,210	£47,998,688	£329,522	£303,273	£289,138	£592,412	£592,412	£592,412	£262,890	-0.5%	£182,012	£182,012	-0.4%	£715,740	£592,412	£171,051	£497,041	£329,886						
4004	Queen Elizabeth	290	£1,466,769	£1,466,769		£1,466,769	£1,466,769	£1,463,187	£3,582	£1,350	£0	£0	£0	£1,350	£4,932	0.3%	£4,932	£4,932	0.3%											
4014	Whitecross Hereford	877	£4,248,983	£4,248,983		£4,248,983	£4,248,983	£4,171,327	£77,655	£12,150	£14,586	£26,736	£26,736	£26,736	£104,392	2.5%	£164,902	£164,902	4.0%											
4015	Aylestone	608	£2,917,404	£2,917,404		£2,917,404	£2,917,404	£2,863,145	£54,259	£3,373	£501	£2,873	£2,873	£2,873	£57,132	2.0%	£130,562	£130,562	4.6%											
4021	Kingstone High School	544	£2,714,338	£2,714,338		£2,714,338	£2,714,338	£2,742,581	£28,244	£5,951	£6,238	£12,190	£12,190	£12,190	£16,054	-0.6%	£128,087	£128,087	-4.7%											
4022	Lady Hawkins' School	368	£1,762,129	£1,762,129		£1,762,129	£1,762,129	£1,777,844	£15,715	£570	£0	£0	£0	£570	£15,146	-0.9%	£15,146	£15,146	-0.9%											
4027	Earl Mortimer College	586	£3,068,470	£3,068,470		£3,068,470	£3,068,470	£3,010,922	£57,548	£2,907	£10,141	£13,048	£13,048	£13,048	£70,597	2.3%	£168,283	£168,283	5.6%											
4032	Fairfield High School	418	£2,154,890	£2,154,890		£2,154,890	£2,154,890	£2,178,579	£23,689	£3,270	£16,500	£19,770	£19,770	£19,770	£3,920	-0.2%	£185,876	£185,876	-8.5%											
4045	Weobley High School	468	£2,342,541	£2,342,541		£2,342,541	£2,342,541	£2,303,450	£39,091	£1,920	£5,500	£7,420	£7,420	£7,420	£46,511	2.0%	£46,511	£46,511	2.0%											
4046	Wigmore High School	460	£2,120,082	£2,120,082		£2,120,082	£2,120,082	£2,082,185	£37,897	£3,270	£5,500	£8,770	£8,770	£8,770	£46,667	2.2%	£71,105	£71,105	3.4%											
4058	John Masefield High School	738	£3,301,385	£3,301,385		£3,301,385	£3,301,385	£3,240,822	£60,563	£30	£0	£0	£0	£30	£60,593	1.9%	£159,365	£159,365	4.9%											
4428	John Kyrle	1103	£5,073,292	£5,073,292		£5,073,292	£5,073,292	£5,128,650	£55,358	£9,627	£18,821	£28,448	£28,448	£28,448	£26,910	-0.5%	£71,383	£71,383	-1.4%											
4600	Bishop of Hereford's Blueco	1162	£5,065,479	£5,065,479		£5,065,479	£5,065,479	£5,060,342	£5,137	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£5,137	0.1%	£5,137	£5,137	0.1%											
4601	St.Mary's	724	£3,199,070	£3,199,070		£3,199,070	£3,199,070	£3,213,970	£14,901	£570	£7,821	£8,390	£8,390	£8,390	£6,511	-0.2%	£6,511	£6,511	-0.2%											

MEETING:	SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE:	19 OCTOBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	MEMBERSHIP OF BUDGET WORKING GROUP
REPORT BY:	GOVERNANCE SERVICES

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To review the composition of the Budget Working Group (BWG).

Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (a) the Forum reviews the membership of the Budget Working Group;
- (b) the Budget Working Group continue to operate on the basis previously agreed by the Forum as set out at paragraph 5 of the report, with small schools and special schools to be represented and with consideration also given to governor involvement;
- (b) there should be a minimum of one maintained school representative from the secondary sector and one academy representative from the primary school sector;
- (c) the factors set out at paragraph 10 are taken into consideration in making appointments to the Budget Working Group;
- (d) that in future membership of the Budget Working Group be reviewed in parallel with membership of the Schools Forum;
- (e) the Forum consider the chairmanship of the Budget Working Group; and
- (f) the current membership of the BWG continues in place until 31 December 2012.

Key Points Summary

- Following changes to the Forum's membership it is suggested that it is timely for the Forum to review the membership of the BWG.

- It is suggested that representatives should be elected by HASH and the Primary Heads Forum having regard to factors set out at paragraph 10 of the report.
- It is proposed to retain a three year term of office for members of the Forum, in principle, running from 1 September. The three year term of office would, however, be subject to an annual review. This review would be aligned with the review of the membership of the Forum itself.
- It is proposed that there is a transitional period during which the existing membership continues pending confirmation by nominating bodies..
- The Forum is invited to consider whether it wishes to nominate someone at this stage as Chairman subject to the nominations to the BWG made by HASH and the Primary Schools Forum.

Alternative Options

- 1 The composition of the BWG could be varied in a number of ways.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 To ensure that the BWG is constituted appropriately.

Introduction and Background

- 3 The Department for Education (DfE) publication Schools Forums: operational and good practice guide – September 2012 notes at paragraph 1.44: *It is open to a Schools Forum to set up working groups of members to discuss specific issues, and to produce draft advice and decisions for the Schools Forum itself to consider. The groups can also include wider representation - for example, an early years reference group can represent all the different types of provider to consider the detail of the early years single funding formula. The reference group would then be able to give its considered view on the local authority's proposals to the Schools Forum. It is not good practice for the Schools Forum to delegate actual decisions or the finalisation of advice to a working group, as this may have the effect of excluding legitimate points of view.*
- 4 The Forum has for a number of years appointed a Budget Working Group. The current terms of reference of the Group are appended. No amendments to the terms of reference are proposed.
- 5 The Forum considered a report on the role and membership of the Group in April 2010 reaching the following principal conclusions, which were accepted by the Forum:
 - a. the membership of the BWG should be transparent and representatives elected by HASH and the Primary Heads Forum
 - b. appointments should be representative of their constituent schools
 - c. appointments should be for three years subject to re-election. Existing members can continue if they are re-elected by their respective group.
 - d. agreed that continuity of membership is important as representatives gain school finance expertise

- e. small schools should be represented but it was recognised that it was difficult for Headteachers of small schools to be released from school.
- f. special schools should be represented
- g. nominated substitutes are permitted if a member couldn't attend.
- h. headteacher representatives would lead in feeding back a summary from the BWG to Schools Forum and preparing other reports.

Key Considerations

- 6 The current membership of the BWG, as described in the appendix, is 14, 11 of whom were members of the Forum prior to the membership being recast. There are now 6 current Members of the BWG who serve on the Forum. The current BWG membership comprises 5 maintained primary school representatives, 1 special school representative, 6 academy representatives (3 primary, 3 secondary) and 2 Early years providers.
- 7 It is suggested that given the recasting of the Forum's membership it is therefore timely to review the membership of the BWG.
- 8 The Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 prescribe how the Forum itself is to be constituted. These provisions do not apply to the composition of the Budget Working Group. That is a matter for the Forum itself as the guidance from the DfE quoted above indicates.
- 9 In April 2010 the Forum agreed the membership of the BWG should be transparent and representatives should be elected by HASH and the Primary Heads Forum. There seems no reason to change that approach, with the addition of Private Voluntary and Independent Sector representatives appointed by the Early Years Forum. It is however, also proposed that consideration needs to be given to governor involvement to be considered through Herefordshire Association of Governors. The Forum is also invited to consider a proposal that there should be a minimum of one maintained school representative from the secondary sector and one academy representative from the primary school sector. It is also proposed that there should continue to be a special school representative nominated by the Herefordshire Special Heads Group.
- 10 The Authority suggests that the Forum recommends that the following factors are taken into consideration in making appointments to the BWG:
- That it would be useful to have half from Schools Forum and half not from the Forum to draw on a wider range of ideas.
 - A representative mix of schools is good but the application of strict proportionality between primary, secondary schools and academies is not required.
 - It would be helpful for there to be some continuity of membership to ensure that the expertise that has been developed is not lost (It generally takes a couple of years to gain expertise.)
 - It would be useful to have representatives from different parts of the County to draw on differing experiences across the County.
- 11 It is proposed that the BWG should remain at 12 members with 2 early years representatives.
- 12 In recasting the membership of the Forum itself it was proposed to retain a three year term of office for members of the Forum, in principle, running from 1 September. The three year term of office would, however, be subject to an annual review. This would provide flexibility to

ensure that broad proportionality of primary schools, secondary schools and academies was maintained. In the event that a member of the Forum ceases to hold the office, the term of office ceases and another appointment must be made. The replacement will serve the remainder of the term. This would provide flexibility to ensure that broad proportionality of primary schools, secondary schools and academies is maintained.

- 13 It seems appropriate to bring review of the membership of the BWG into alignment with the review of the membership of the Forum itself. This would mirror the approach of the local authority where membership of Committees is subject to an annual review.
- 14 There are two tasks the BWG needs to undertake in November/December (to consider any final adjustments to the national school funding formula (Schools Block) and to make recommendations on the use of the Dedicated Schools Grant underspend 2011/12). It is therefore proposed that there is a transitional period during which the existing membership continues pending HASH and the primary heads forum confirming representation, subject to the decisions the Forum decides to make on the BWG's composition. It would seem sensible for the new membership, as agreed by the Forum, to be in place by 1 January 2013 to finalise proposals for the High Needs and early years block budgets for 2013/14.
- 15 The Forum has itself on occasion determined the Chairmanship of the BWG. There is no requirement that the Chairman of the BWG is a member of the Forum. However, as the Chairman of the BWG has to report to the Forum on behalf of the BWG and therefore attend almost all Forum meetings there may be an advantage in the Chairman being a member of the Forum. The Forum is invited to consider whether it wishes to nominate someone at this stage as Chairman subject to the nominations to the BWG made by HASH and the Primary Schools Forum.

Community Impact

- 16 None

Equality and Human Rights

- 17 No implications

Financial Implications

- 18 None

Legal Implications

19. None

Risk Management

- 20 No implications

Consultees

- 21 None

Appendices

- Current Terms of Reference and Membership of the Budget Working Group

Background Papers

- None identified.

Current Terms of Reference and Membership of the Budget Working Group

This group is established as a permanent advisory sub-group of the full Schools Forum. Importantly it reports to Schools Forum (SF), and is not itself a decision-making body.

Remit:

To provide additional support and time to consider information and data in order to inform the development of key budgetary options, recommendations and decisions relating to Dedicated Schools Grant.

Membership:

As appointed by HASH, Primary Head Teachers and Early Years Forum.

Operating principles:

To assess financial information prior to presentation to Schools Forum

To consider implications of any financial proposal

To draft papers for submission to full Schools Forum meetings

To provide considered information and advice to support the work of the full Schools Forum.

Current Membership

Peter Box or Paul Whitcombe - Lord Scudamore – Primary Academy

John Docherty - Bursar John Kryle – Secondary Academy

Nicky Gilbert – Westfield – Locally Maintained Special School

Mike Goodman – QE - -Secondary Academy

Nigel Griffiths - John Kryle – Academy

Alison Jackson - Early Years Provider

Sue Jones – Clehonger - Locally maintained primary

Rose Lloyd - Early Years Provider

Tracey Kneale – Marlbrook - Locally maintained primary

Euan McGilp - St Martins - Locally maintained primary

Julie Powell - Lugwardine (Chair of BWG) – Primary Academy

Ann Pritchard – Trinity - Locally maintained primary

Steve Pugh - Hampton Dene – Locally maintained primary

Andrew Teale - St Paul's – Primary Academy

MEETING:	HEREFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE:	19 OCTOBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	WORK PROGRAMME
REPORT BY:	GOVERNANCE SERVICES

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To consider the Forum's work programme.

Recommendation

THAT: the Work Programme be noted, subject to any comments the Forum wishes to make.

Herefordshire Schools Forum – Work Programme 2012/13

7 December 2012 9.30 am Brockington

- Report of Budget Working Group (DSG underspend)
- Final School Budgets for Submission to the Education Funding Agency
 - Schools Funding Block
 - High Needs Block
 - Early Years Block
- School Funding 13/14 – Draft Budgets
- Capital Investment 2012/13 Update
- Workplan 2012/13
- Dates of Meetings

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Governance Services on (01432) 260239

25 January 2013 9.30 am Brockington
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of Budget Working Group • Workplan 2012/13 Dates of Meetings
28 February 2013 9.30 am Brockington
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of Budget Working Group • School Funding 2013/14 – Final Budgets for High Needs and Early Years Blocks • Schools Capital Investment Programme Principles (2013/14) • Workplan 2012/13 • Dates of Meetings
<i>(Provisional) 12 March 2013 9.30 pm Brockington</i>
<i>(This meeting was originally scheduled in the event that agreement on budgets could not be reached at the February meeting. This is no longer required because changes by the DfE mean that budgets have to be set in December.)</i>

Background Papers

- None identified.